

to more than 20 Federal cases brought against the Federal agency since 2007. Much of that litigation has been aimed at the Bureau of Reclamation water projects and farmers and ranchers who serve by them. Congress should not be rewarding such serial litigation. That is one of the things I would have asked to have been removed had we started from scratch in this process.

But above all, the amendment simply erases the flexibility, erases the transparency, and erases the science improvements that are part of the underlying bill that are so essential; that the elements of those people who live in these communities, who recreate in these areas, who use the commercial side, the fishing side, have all said we are not doing what we need to do; that the present system does have flaws in it and needs to be changed, and we need to move forward on that bill. The underlying bill does that. This amendment does not do that.

I urge a “no” vote on this particular amendment and urge us to move forward with the bill as written.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, I am offering an Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute for H.R. 1335, which was submitted to the Rules Committee by my colleague Mr. HUFFMAN.

Mr. Chair, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act is a sterling example of good federal policy and has helped make the United States the world leader in sustainable fisheries management.

When we last reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens in 2007, we required the use of annual catch limits to end and prevent overfishing.

Using this management tool—annual catch limits—we have increased the number of American fish stocks with populations sufficiently large that we can count on their ability to continue reproducing.

Using annual catch limits as our guide, we have reduced the number of stocks being fished in excess of maximum sustainable yield—to an all-time low.

Magnuson-Stevens has proven to be effective environmental policy.

It is also good economic policy.

U.S. fisheries contributed nearly \$90 billion and 1.5 million jobs to the economy in 2012. And the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration estimates that, when we have fully rebuilt our fisheries, they will add another \$31 billion to our national economy and produce 500,000 new jobs.

Of course, we learn as we go; and there are ways that Magnuson-Stevens could be made even more effective as environmental and economic policy. The Huffman-Sablan amendment in the nature of a substitute provides some of that fine-tuning.

And our amendment does that without undermining the annual catch limits regime and other core principles that have made Magnuson-Stevens so effective.

H.R. 1335, on the other hand, risks backsliding on the progress we have made.

I recognize that some of these issues are technical in nature, but bear with me.

H.R. 1335 would allow non-target stocks in a fishery to be defined as ecosystem component species, which are not subject to annual

catch limits, even if these non-target stocks are depleted or overfished. For instance, H.R. 1335 would allow Atlantic halibut to be reclassified as an ecosystem component species, no longer subject to an annual catch limit. Yet, Atlantic halibut today are finally rebuilding after decades of decline. H.R. 1335 would put that progress at risk.

Another problem with H.R. 1335 is that it tries to conform the timelines in the National Environmental Policy Act with timelines in Magnuson-Stevens. This could force the Secretary of Commerce to approve fishery management plans that have not had the full benefit of National Environmental Policy Act analysis—particularly, by reducing the amount of time that the public has to comment on federal action. I do not think we want to be cutting the public out of this important decision-making process.

A third problem area for H.R. 1335 is that it prohibits information sharing. Fisheries data collected by NOAA in the process of administering Magnuson-Stevens could not be used in the management of other marine resources managed under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, the Antiquities Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Nor could the Magnuson-Stevens fisheries data be used in managing offshore energy exploration and development, or water pollution, or coastal resources. That does not really make much sense.

The substitute amendment Mr. HUFFMAN and I are offering avoids these pitfalls. We simply want to improve fisheries research and management to benefit fishermen and fishing communities.

How does our amendment do that?

By implementing electronic monitoring to lower costs for the fishing fleet;

By improving the collection of fisheries data, which we all agree is lacking;

By increasing cooperative research and management efforts between scientists and fishermen;

By making the operations of the Regional Fishery Management Councils more transparent and open to public participation;

By allowing the Councils to select individuals who have expertise on subsistence fishing practices, so we incorporate the interests and expertise of Alaska Natives, Pacific Islanders, and Indian Tribes; and

By recognizing the subsistence fishing may encompass more than personal consumption, but also includes some small-scale, low technology, commercial fishing.

And our amendment makes these improvements in Magnuson-Stevens without undermining core policies that have made the Act so effective.

Magnuson-Stevens is passed due for reauthorization. But let us do so in a way that does not jeopardize the progress we have made, so we can keep building more sustainable and more profitable fisheries for today and for our nation's future.

I ask my colleagues to support the Huffman-Sablan amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOBIONDO) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1335) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY TO MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 336) to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, to convey certain Federal property located in the State of Alaska to the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 336

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REAL PROPERTY CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and after completion of the survey and appraisal described in this section, the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, shall convey to the City by quitclaim deed for the consideration described in subsection (c), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property described in subsection (b).

(b) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The parcel to be conveyed under subsection (a) consists of approximately 9 acres and improvements located at 400 East Fortieth Avenue in the City that is administered by the National Archives and Records Administration.

(2) SURVEY REQUIRED.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey, paid for by the City, that is satisfactory to the Archivist.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance of the property under subsection (a), the City shall pay to the Archivist an amount not less than the fair market value of the conveyed property, to be determined as provided in subparagraph (B).